

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| M.C., who sues by and through her |) | |
| mother and next friend, GAIL TATUM, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:06cv83-LES |
| |) | (LEAD CASE) |
| PACTIV CORPORATION, <i>et al</i> , |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER

Now pending before the court are the following motions for an order to permit the scheduling of expedited depositions in the following cases.

2:06cv83-LES, M.C. v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 47

2:06cv84-LES, Phillips v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 50

2:06cv85-LES, Thompson v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 53

2:06cv86-LES, Edwards v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 51

2:06cv186-LES, Madden v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 55

2:06cv187-LES, Davis v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 56

2:06cv188-LES, Douglas v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 56

2:06cv189-LES, Thompson v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 54

2:06cv190-LES, Kelley v. Pactiv Corp., et al., Doc. # 53

On May 23, 2006, the court held a status conference and heard argument on the pending motions. At that time, the parties discussed the taking of ten (10) expedited discovery. On July 10, 2006, the court heard oral argument on a discovery motion, and at

that time, the parties informed the court that the expedited depositions were scheduled to take place within the next two motions. Accordingly, upon consideration of the motions, and for good cause, it is

ORDERED that the motions for an order to permit the scheduling of expedited depositions in the afore-referenced cases be and are hereby DENIED as moot.

Done this 12th day of July, 2006.

/s/Charles S. Coody
CHARLES S. COODY
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE